DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 031 350 RC 003 568

By-Franklin, Mayer J., Ed.; And Others

Proceedings of the Conference on Increasing Opportunities for Mexican American Students in Higher Education (Los Angeles Harbor College, California, May 15-17, 1969).

California State Coll., Long Beach.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date May 69
Note-67p.
Available from-United Mexican American Students (UMAS), California State College, Long Beach, California 90801.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$3.45
Descriptors-Bilingualism, College Admission, *Conference Reports, Counseling, Cultural Awareness, Disadvantaged Youth, *Educational Opportunities, Educational Problems, Equal Education, Federal Programs, Financial Support, *Higher Education, *Mexican Americans, *School Holding Power, Sensitivity Training, Testing, Workshops

The conference was conducted in order to propose solutions to the problems that confront the Mexican American student in higher education in areas of recruitment, retention, and financial assistance. Colleges and universities from 5 Southwestern states sent teams (student, faculty member, administrator, junior college representative, high school counselor, and representative of the Mexican American community) to participate in the conference. The conference proceedings present: the keynote address given by Armando Rodriguez, Chief of Mexican American Affairs Unit in the U. S. Office of Education; selected remarks by various participants; and an address by Philip Montez, Regional Director, Los Angeles, United States Civil Rights Commission. Suggestions taken from the general session, the problems and issues discussed in the workshops, and the resolutions passed by the conference are given. Selected remarks from the closing address given by Father Henry J. Casso, Vicar of Urban Affairs, San Antonio, Texas, conclude the report. (CM)

ED031350

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE ON INCREASING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MEXICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

RECEIVED
AUG 18 1969

Sponsored by

CSCLB United Mexican American Students

California State College, Long Beach

and

United States Office of Education

May 15, 16, 17, 1969

California State College, Long Beach

in Association with

Los Angeles Harbor College

RC003568

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE CONFERENCE ON INCREASING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MEXICAN AMERICAN STUDENTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION

edited by

Mayer J. Franklin, Ph. D.

Terry Martin

Corinne Sánchez

Published for

The National Training Program for Teachers, Counselors and Administrators Involved in the Recruitment, Retention and Financial Assistance of Mexican Americans in Higher Education

by

California State College, Long Beach

May 1969

This monograph was prepared pursuant to a contract with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, represent official Office of Education position policy.

CONTENTS

Preface iii

Program 1

Opening Statement, by Dr. Mayer J. Franklin 4

Keynote Address, by Armando Rodriguez 5

Selected Remarks, by George A. Dawson, Jr. 12

Selected Remarks, by Dr. Uvaldo Palomares 18

Address, by Philip Montez 21

Selected Remarks, by Dr. Joseph Michel. 29

Selected Remarks, by David Johnson. 34

Bus Tour of the Harbor Area 38

Suggestions Taken from General Session. 40

Workshops 43

Resolutions Passed by the Conference. 49

Selected Remarks - Closing Address,
by Father Henry J. Casso 53

The Work is Just Beginning. 61

Papers Published in Connection with the Conference. 62

PREFACE

Sponsored by the United States Office of Education, in association with California State College at Long Beach and the United Mexican American Students (UMAS), a National Training Program for Teachers, Counselors, and Administrators involved in the recruitment, the retention, and the financial assistance of the minority group student was initiated in February, 1969. This was the first program sponsored by the United States Office of Education in which all levels of the academic community, including students, community leaders and college administrators, participated equally in the planning and formation of the program activities. The program was designed to increase participant understanding of minority group students and to develop and implement plans to assist in the recruitment, the retention and the financial assistance of Mexican American students.

The central activity of the training program consisted of a National Conference which was held May 15, 16, and 17, 1969, on the campus of Los Angeles Harbor College, Wilmington, California. The conference was conducted in order to propose solutions to the problems that confront the Mexican American student in higher education. Colleges and universities from the five Southwestern states were asked to send teams consisting of a student, a faculty member, an administrator, a junior college representative, a high school counselor, and a representative of the Mexican American community.

The areas for discussion during the conference were outlined from the contents of ten position papers written by noted experts, students, and members of the community on the problems of recruitment, retention and financial assistance. To establish a line of communication and visualization of a special need for programs to be implemented for the betterment of the Mexican American student, the Los Angeles Harbor area community was actively involved. To encourage complete participation of the community, each trainee was lodged in a Mexican American household within the Los Angeles Harbor area community. The Los Angeles Harbor College was asked to provide conference facilities to allow the community to be directly involved throughout the program and placing the trainees in the environment of the student, both at home and in the educational system.

It is impossible to acknowledge each individual who contributed to making this program a reality. Special credit is due, however, to Dr. Mayer J. Franklin, director of the program

for his efforts throughout the program. Special credit is also due to Dr. John Nicklin and his colleagues at Harbor College for their assistance in all aspects of coordination of the conference. Sincere appreciation is extended to each member of the advisory board who gave guidance to each phase of the conference. Credit is also extended to each of the workshop leaders for their assistance and interest in a subject to which they are all committed. A large part of whatever success can be attributed to the conference is a result of the help and guidance of Mrs. Ann Ramirez. A special word of thanks should be given to each of the student assistants and the program secretary for their patience and their ability to anticipate and correct the problems before they developed. Appreciation is also extended to the United States Office of Education for their cooperation especially to Mr. Armando Rodriguez, Chief of the Mexican American Affairs Unit, and his assistant Mr. Dean Bistline, to Dr. Paul H. Carnell, Mr. George A. Dawson, Jr., and Mr. David Johnson.

Finally, credit is due each person who attended and participated in the conference. It is hoped that each person who attended has gained some knowledge and awareness of the problems of Mexican American students and the need to provide greater educational opportunities for Mexican American students in the Southwest and throughout the nation.

Frank Sanchez
Conference Coordinator

PROGRAM

Wednesday, May 14

Registration, informal group meetings, coffee, orientation to the Harbor College.

Thursday, May 15

9:00 a.m. General Session

Opening Statement .....Dr. Mayer J. Franklin
Project Director

9:05 a.m. Greetings .....The Honorable Edmond J. Russ
Mayor of Gardena

9:10 a.m. Greetings .....Dr. Wendell C. Black
President, Los Angeles Harbor College

9:20 a.m. Greetings .....Dr. Donald H. Simonsen
Academic Vice-President
California State College, Long Beach

9:30 a.m. Keynote Address ....Mr. Armando Rodriguez
Chief, Mexican American Affairs Unit
United States Office of Education

11:15 a.m. Remarks .....Mr. George Dawson, Jr.
Special Assistant for the Associate Commissioner for Higher Education, United States Office of Education

12:00 Noon Closing Remarks .....Mr. Frank Sanchez
Conference delegates will be involved in a two-day series of closed work sessions from 12:30 p.m., May 15, to 12:30 p.m., May 17, working on problems of recruitment, retention and financial assistance for Mexican American students in higher education.

12:30 p.m. Tour of Harbor College North Campus. Guides from UMAS, Harbor College.

1:00 p.m. Luncheon, Seahawk Center

2:30 p.m. Tour of Harbor area. Buses furnished, courtesy of Los Angeles City School District. Guides from UMAS, California State College, Long Beach.

5:30 p.m. Dinner in Wilmington with hosts from the Mexican American community.

Friday, May 16

9:00 a.m. Speaker .....Dr. Uvaldo Palomares

9:00 a.m.- 1:00 p.m. Second General Session
Panel discussion on problems, goals and purposes of the Conference.

PANELISTS

Frank Sanchez, Chairman; Frank Sandoval, Sy Abrego, United Mexican American Students, CSCLB (Students); Dr. Joseph Michel, University of Texas, Austin (Faculty); Dr. James Officer, University of Arizona, Tucson (Administrator); Dave Rappaport, President, California School Counselors Association (Counselor); Mrs. Ann Ramirez, Field Representative, Congressman Glenn Anderson (Community); Reverend Henry J. Casso, San Antonio, Texas (Junior College); Dr. Uvaldo Palomares, Human Development Training Institute, San Diego; Dr. Manuel Guerra, California State College, Long Beach.

10:15 a.m.- 10:30 a.m. Coffee Break

1:00 p.m.- 2:00 p.m. Luncheon .....Speaker, Philip Montez

2:00 p.m.- 5:30 p.m. Workshops. Conferees will meet with their special groups as follows:

Workshop #1 - Faculty and Students
Workshop #2 - Administrators and Students
Workshop #3 - Counselors and Community Representatives

5:30 p.m.- 7:00 p.m. Dinner ....Speaker, Dr. Joseph Michel

7:00 p.m.- 9:30 p.m. Continuation of Workshops

9:30 p.m. Adjourn

Saturday, May 17

9:00 a.m. General Meeting - Discussion and voting on results of Workshops.

10:00 a.m. Workshops as on Friday: to make final recommendations.

12:00 Noon Lunch

1:30 p.m. Closing Session
Speakers: Father Henry J. Casso
David S. Johnson, U.S. Office of Education

Presentation of findings and recommendations.

Acknowledgements:

Dr. Mayer J. Franklin, Project Director
Dr. Henry S. Johnson, Human Relations Center, CSCLB
Mr. Frank Sanchez, Executive Assistant, Conference Coordinator
Miss Terry Martin, Registration
Mr. Louis Rosales, Housing and Food Services
Miss Corinne Sánchez, Secretarial Services and Tour Coordinator
Mr. Armando Vazquez, Program and Workshop Arrangements
Dr. John Nicklin, Coordinator for Harbor College
Miss Magdalena Esqueda, Secretary, Community Services, for Harbor College
Mrs. Nan Miller, Student Activities Supervisor for Harbor College
Mrs. Ann Ramirez, Community Coordinator
Mrs. Thekla Jeremiassen, Secretary
UMAS, CSCLB and Harbor College, Hosts and Guides
Association of Mexican American Educators, Harbor Chapter, Hospitality
The Mexican American Community of the Los Angeles Harbor Area, Home Hospitality

OPENING STATEMENT

Dr. Mayer J. Franklin greeted the conferees and thanked Mr. Armando Rodriguez and Mr. Frank Sánchez, who conceived and elaborated the program, and the officers and members of UMAS (United Mexican American Students) of California State College at Long Beach, who planned and executed the conference. He thanked the administration and staff of California State College at Long Beach, the Los Angeles Board of Education and Los Angeles Harbor College. He also expressed warm appreciation for their contributions to the success of the conference of Mrs. Ann Ramirez, of the Mexican American families of the Harbor community, and of the Harbor Chapter of the Association of Mexican American Educators.

"Our purpose in calling this Conference is to bring together all segments of the college and general community to work out practical programs which will result in the increase of the number of Mexican Americans in higher education. To this end, teams of students, faculty members, administrators, high school counselors, junior college representatives, and representatives of the Mexican American community have gathered here to meet and confer. We hope that this will not just be a pleasant talk session, although the meeting and making of new friends is always a very pleasant by-product of a Conference of this nature. We expect that by Saturday afternoon we will have prepared tangible programs to present to our home institutions, to local, state, and national educational authorities, and to private citizens so that seven million Mexican American citizens of our country will be represented in college in true proportion to their numbers in our communities, and that they will enter into the technical and professional ranks, into education, industry, business, and high level managerial and executive positions."

"This three-day program is a first of its kind. Conferees will be living with Mexican American families. There will be mutual understanding and appreciation of the diversity of our American cultures. This is a historic moment. We have a great responsibility, for we are developing a new kind of program, one that will lead to the rise of minorities so they will enjoy the same privileges of higher education that should be enjoyed by all Americans."

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Armando Rodriguez
Chief Mexican American Affairs Unit
U. S. Office of Education

THE MEXICAN AMERICAN AND HIGHER EDUCATION

I am here today with mixed feelings. I am delighted that we have been able to put together this first conference to look closely at the Mexican American and his part of the action in higher education. I am sorry that it is necessary for any of us to be here at all. For one of the first things to be said about holding a conference on higher education for Mexican Americans in America is that there should be no need to hold such a meeting.

Nearly two hundred years after the Declaration of Independence, more than a hundred years after the Treaty of Guadalupe-Hidalgo, more than a decade after the first major entrance of the Federal Government into aid to Higher Education, we should have progressed to the point where all of our society could look without fear toward maximum educational opportunity. But, unfortunately, the bitterness that rolls across the campuses of many of our colleges and high schools today is born out of the frustration of barriers to maximum educational opportunity.

I had the great pleasure to speak to the first annual Mexican American Youth Adelante Conference in Boulder, Colorado just a week ago today. It was a tremendous thrill to see over five hundred Chicano young people brought together to explore opportunities for higher education. The drive and determination of young Chicanos to fight their way into maximum educational opportunities is the brightest picture for immediate change for all of us. Just two weeks ago I made a whirlwind tour of seven cities in the West and Southwest talking with Mexican American youngsters about the causes of student unrest. Their observations left me depressed and fighting mad. I note that now Life Magazine begins a series on this same educational dilemma.

I can not talk about higher education for the Mexican American without taking account of these developments. I can not talk about higher education for the Mexican American without noting that higher education enrollments have increased fifty-eight

per cent for Anglos in the past five years, and yet less than two per cent of our Mexican Americans are in college. And here in the center of the largest concentration of Mexican Americans in the U. S. A., California State at Los Angeles has dropped in enrollment of Mexican Americans from six per cent to less than four per cent in a single year. I am disturbed by recent figures from HEW that show a rise of twenty-three per cent in costs of tuition, fees, board and room at public colleges and universities during the past five years. And while I do not begrudge them their opportunity, I am concerned by the report that more than 4,200 Cuban refugee students are attending 365 American Colleges this year with the help of four million dollars in Federal loans. And in the past eight years, an estimated 12,000 needy Cuban students have received more than 50,000 educational loans. All this at a time when thousands of American students, especially Chicano students, are being turned away or having to drop out of school for lack of financial resources. But, I am really bothered when I read an editorial of May 12th in the Washington Post: on "Federal Disinheritance".

This editorial commented on the fact that the proposed Fiscal Year 1970 budget cut National Defense Student Loans from $270 million to $155 million, the College Work-Study Program by thirty-one per cent from $311 to $146 million and cut Educational Opportunity Grants in half. These cuts would deprive thousands of needy students from attending college. It concluded with the question, "Can this nation reclaim the trust and the allegiance of its young by disinheriting them?"

With the possibilities outlined in that editorial, it is difficult to look ahead with high hope and expectations that the reality of maximum educational opportunity will take place soon. But for the Mexican American the problem is not solely financial aid. We must look squarely at the earlier levels of education that have so much to say about who gets a higher education.

It is true today, as it was ten or twenty years ago, that the elementary and secondary education made available to the Mexican American is utterly inadequate. But we can point to one element of progress--Chicanos are rising throughout the country to insure that this condition will not continue. This nations's conscience, I am sure, is far from clear about the self-defeating, mono-lingual, mono-cultural, second-rate elementary and secondary schooling that has been the lot of the Mexican American and members of other minority groups--including a good number of poor whites. Our country can not continue to offer inferior education to those who most need excellent education--the neediest, the least powerful, and the most oppressed. For

today the difference is that those who need excellent education most are going to get it--one way or another. This was made loud and clear to me during my recent trip, and reinforces what the Mexican American Community has been telling me from Texas to California to the Midwest for the past two years.

If there is one single charge to this conference--it is to bring to the door of the Mexican American every resource, every opportunity, every commitment of the schools--elementary, secondary, higher education--for his participation in maximum educational opportunity. To do less is to deny him, the Chicano, "men's worlds."

There is no more significant question related to education facing the country today than the question of whether it will dilute the Federal effort to focus available funds on the problems of the poor, the racial minority, the culturally different. The Post editorial raises some serious doubts in the minds of many as to the commitment of a Federal effort in higher education. We cannot afford to lose the momentum that we have taken so long to build up. Will our students have to become political refugees to gain the recognition and support necessary to pursue higher education? I want to commend the NEA and allied organizations for the recent creation of a group to press for full funding of all educational programs now a part of the Federal effort. It is through the actions of such groups like this that we can make a substantial impact on the imperative need for total educational support.

The Federal education programs now underway--large as they may seem to be--are really little more than pilot projects taken when you look at them in terms of the vast educational needs that must be met. We are a long way from knowing for certain exactly what we should do to offer quality education to the poor and racial minority, the culturally enriched, the Chicano.

We do know, of course, that we should reach children younger, we know we need to bring the home and the community into the school environment, we know we need to train teachers differently. We know we need to do these and many other things now--or else it will be too late. Unless there is clear evidence of full commitment to existing Federal programs, there is little doubt that those already directly affected by such programs will continue to bear the burdens of second class citizenship.

There is clear indication that the major emphasis in the crisis in education is the failure of government to bring the dreams or ideals into reality from Blacks and Browns the young and the poor. We are confronted with the rising expectation of these groups as to what the United States can become and must become. What we are really talking about here is a major attack

on an educational system whose premise of operation has been exclusion. Public education, from elementary through higher education, at its earliest stage, was created to exclude people who failed to adopt or share the Anglo-Saxon life style. The present structure of education has done little to eradicate this posture. The stress on this structure is now hardest at the levels of higher education and rural education.

When this nation in 1954 undertook a program of inclusion of all its people, it made a moral and legal commitment which accounts for the fantastic revolution which has shaken the educational establishment. Today we have created an intolerable environment for a once highly successful, sophicated system of education. We are now demanding that this system, created for exclusion, become inclusive. And to do this is to render that system dysfunctional. No matter how many alternatives are programmed into our present system, the basic design makes it impossible to function in its expected new role.

Our educational system today is capable of denying any group or person their personal identity. This simply means that the educational system will exclude all who are not able to embrace the Anglo-Saxon life style and culture. The continuance of this system to carry out the function of inclusion can only result in the total devastation of the system. It is this reality that we must face. It is this reality that government must accept and move immediately to change. No government has the right to foster and create revolution--yet this government has, by demanding that a system do something it was not created for. A government cannot moralize, it cannot dream--it does have the responsibility to define reality and create systems that can function in that reality.

It seems to me that the courses open to government are clear and rather simple: (1) return to the realities of the past and continue to exclude or (2) create a system that will carry out the post-1954 concept of education. What today is called the Brown and Black crisis in education, the urban crisis in education, the student crisis in education is a result of our government playing at revolution. Fundamentally, a system which is created for the sole purpose of excluding cannot be altered to include that which it was created to exclude. My friends, we are here today for the basic purpose of beginning to create a system that will include all--a system that welds together the secondary and higher education motivations into a single purpose unit--opportunity for all to be included in maximum educational opportunity.

In the long run, obviously, the strengthening of educational opportunities through a reconstruction of our total system to enable it to function for inclusion will do the most to remove the obstacles to higher education for the Mexican American. But

as John Maynard Keynes said, "in the long run we're all dead." But I propose that this conference be the kick off of one of the fastest change games in our history, that accommodation and inclusion be the game, that whatever system you have been using in your high schools and colleges to recruit and retain Mexican American students be thoroughly overhauled. Examine every minute procedure to eliminate even the slightest element of exclusion. The name of the game today is include! This new game particularly applies to you high school counselors, your college admission officers, you financial aids officers. If you are not sure where to start in including the Mexican American, I refer you to some of the excellent papers prepared for the conferences--all of them are good, but I want to single out those by Phil Montez, Dr. Guerra, and Dr. Angel. And if you are ready to create a new system--one that has inclusion as its basic premise--read, and re-read René Nuñez' paper. You may not agree with all of it--but you can not deny that what René is saying is right on target when we face the reality of higher education for the Mexican American.

The time has come for this country to do two things: first, to guarantee that every student with ability to pursue a higher education have the resources and opportunity to do so--no matter what his income, race, culture, or past track record. And this track record means going beyond this basic guarantee to find ways to offer quality education to those who, because of whatever may be the circumstances, did not receive the academic preparation ordinarily required for the pursuit of higher education. Second, the institutions of higher education must re-structure their academic environment so that it is compatible and consistent with the demands of today's society upon its products. One of the best examples of what I am talking about is the demand by the Black law students at Howard University for some classes on welfare law. What could be more relevant in our society where we produce almost as many starving people as those overfed, almost as many welfare people as millionaires.

This re-structuring also means that we must redefine what we mean by quality and standards on the one hand and ability on the other. We are going to have to stop equating ability simply with performance as measured at a given moment and expand the meaning of that word to include some concept of potential related to motivation, to past deprivation, and to the possibility of rapid change in individual performance through special and intensive assistance.

Quality, I would suggest, must come more and more to measure the ability of our colleges and universities to offer genuine learning experience to different kinds of students--especially the culturally different. And ability must, I think, be interpreted in terms that reflect an understanding of the fact that

evidence of poor preparation does not necessarily mean innate incapacity. We are just now beginning to learn that education can't start too soon, we are learning that it can begin a lot later than we used to think.

I want to touch briefly on one other area that is critical in the rising role of the Mexican American in higher education. This is this whole business of student rights. I mentioned earlier that one of the brightest spots on the drive for increased participation by Chicanos in maximum educational opportunity is that of the young Chicano movement. The forceful determination of UMAS, MAYO, MAYA, and other groups to make the college scene for themselves and their younger brothers and sisters is our strongest force right now. But this movement, or for that matter any student movement, must be regarded until otherwise proven as a legitimate step to secure economic, political, social and educational rights. And that such actions must be protected by the same laws that protect the rest of us. I am deeply disturbed by the vigorous attempts by segments of our ruling society to isolate and to identify the student movement as one which must be regarded as receiving special legal application. Our students, God bless them, are doing things that many of us failed to do. They are making education a right for all, not a privilege for some. I urge that all of us here today become defenders and supporters of the legal and legitimate rights of our students to promote and to demand maximum educational opportunity for all.

This conference has the responsibility of setting a pace and a plan for dynamic action programs for the Mexican American in higher education. I am tired of talking, and I sense that many others, especially our students, are tired of talk. I urge that you leave this conference with a bold, clearly defined action program for making the college the most important goal--and a realizable goal for every Chicano youngster in the country. Let's not have empty resolutions, filled with false hope. Let's take back to our communities carefully defined plans that scream with immediate action--that are attainable now. I want to see a deluge of proposals to the Federal government with imagination, with courage, and with the major focus of inclusion. I want to see skillful, tough programs that bring the high school and the college into constant relations that result in a dragnet of recruitment of Mexican Americans. This conference is not a beginning--the students have already begun--this conference is to take the student's beginning--join them in putting the substance of the Federal government, the colleges and the high schools into a model package for immediate and concerted action. This is what the next three days is all about.

The Washington Post raised the question, "Can this nation reclaim the trust and allegiance of its young by disinheriting them?" The National Advisory Committee on Mexican American

Education in its report, The Mexican American: Quest for Equality, raised the question, "Is only a monolingual, monocultural society acceptable in American?" The answers to both of these questions confront us here today. It is obvious that the melting pot ideology that we speak of so proudly has not produced a moral climate in which all citizens are accepted on the basis of individual worth. It is obvious, also, that our educational system has not produced a climate in which maximum educational opportunity is available to all. I ask all of you here today to join me in a fight to make Cultural diversity and its richness a catalyst for educational change. We must become experts in educational revolution in the guerrilla warfare of attitude and behavior change. We must become experts in the politics of human rights and maximum educational opportunity. We all must play a more active and aggressive role in seeking out, assisting in college decisions and financially supporting Mexican American students. It is only through such vigorous movements that the entrance of the Mexican American into the scene of higher education will bring to our country the strong fabric of cultural cognizance and thereby enrich our entire society.

The Chicano is coming out of Tortilla Flats, one way or another--NOW--and universities and colleges must be ready for him and NOW! We Chicanos must lead the way. No one else can or must do it for us. As we move forward we must remember and say---really shout! The challenge of our forefathers:

Viva la causa!
Viva los estudiantes!
Viva la Raza!
Viva toda la Raza!
Que Dios nos bendiga!
Gracias por su atención!

SELECTED REMARKS

George A. Dawson, Jr.
Special Assistant for the
Associate Commissioner for Higher
Education,
United States Office of Education

I am very happy to be participating with you today in a historic first occasion which augurs well for the nation's future. Never before--at least to my knowledge--has the Federal Government sponsored a training program specifically designed to increase higher educational opportunities for Mexican American youth. Indeed, until a few years ago, many of us working on the sleepy banks of the Potomac were not even very much aware of the unique educational problems faced by millions of Spanish-speaking people struggling to assert the richness of their cultural heritage within the framework of the larger American society. Thanks to the recent efforts of the Mexican American community--as reported daily in newspapers across the country, and those of a very effective "inside" man, Armando Rodriguez--the Office of Education is now trying to fulfill its responsibility to this important segment of the American population.

In his eloquent monograph prepared for this conference, Dr. Manuel Guerra describes two weaknesses of the Anglo professional--of which I myself am a certified example. "First, his naiveté that all American children are the same; and second, his posture to defend his ignorance rather than correct it." I would like everyone to know that I have no intention today of defending my ignorance, which at least in the area of Mexican American language and culture is nothing less than monumental. If I and others like me from the majority community were more enlightened and sensitive in this regard, there would, in fact, be no need for the conference. So I shall restrict my comments today to an area I do know something about--namely, categorical programs administered by the Office of Education which could be imaginatively tapped in a common effort to move our society toward a new kind of mutually respected cultural pluralism that will enhance and invigorate the lives of all Americans.

Perhaps I shall begin by defining what we mean by "categorical program." We in the bureaucracy are prone to use

the term in a variety of contexts, but in the Office of Education it generally refers to a Congressionally authorized activity that is designed to relate to a definable educational problem--or category, if you will--through the massive infusion of Federal funds.

It is only recently that we have come to understand the fundamental relatedness of the various categories in higher education. How, for example, can we seriously address ourselves to the problem of increasing higher educational opportunity without reflecting on the relevance of existing curriculum and teaching methods--not only for the students who were previously excluded, but for the main body of students as well? How can we define a new role for the university with respect to the surrounding urban community without considering the relevance of traditional admissions standards which systematically deny the members of that community an opportunity to develop their talents? And how can we address ourselves to meaningful curriculum reform without recognizing the impulse of present day students to learn about the complexities of modern life by becoming directly involved in the urban world outside the college gates?

But while it is clear that the pressing problems of higher education are very much interrelated, it remains a fact that the sources of Federal aid are categorical programs which, by law, must be directed at one or another of the component parts. It remains for the individual higher education community--administration, students, faculty, parents, and urban residents--first, to articulate its comprehensive goals and then to seek aid under the specific Federal programs which can make an important contribution.

For purposes of exposition, I will describe the programs which may be applicable to institutional efforts in three major problem areas, keeping in mind that the categories--to some extent at least--are really artificial. First, increasing higher education opportunity; second, devising approaches to curriculum, teaching, and governance; and third, responding to what has been called "the crisis of the cities."

It was not too long ago that improved higher educational opportunity--particularly for the historically repressed minorities--was rather far down the list of the Nation's priority issues. The first recognition of the National Defense Student Loans program in 1958. This program--still among the most popular administered by the office of Education--was followed in subsequent years by College Work-Study, Educational Opportunity Grants, and Guaranteed Loans programs. All of them are intended to help break down the financial barrier to higher

education, and all but the last are administered through the individual institutions of higher education.

We have only recently begun to collect from colleges and universities a body of hard data on the participation of various ethnic groups in the institution-based financial aid programs. In the near future we expect to analyze these figures in some depth to determine their implications on future policies. For the present, I can only report that raw data derived from the FY 1968 fiscal operations report shows that Spanish-surnamed students accounted for about 2.6 percent of the total number of students receiving college aid under one or more of the office of Education's institution-based programs--Educational Opportunity Grants, National Defense Student Loans, and College Work-Study.

In 1964, the Congress included Upward Bound as part of the Economic Opportunity Act, and with that action introduced a new dimension to the concept of equal educational opportunity. No longer was the lack of financial resources seen as the only hurdle the poor but potentially college-able youngster to surmount. Upward Bound recognized that social and educational deprivation were equally disabling factors in the struggle for self-improvement; it sought to partially compensate for such inequities by placing selected youngsters in a summer preparation program run by colleges, universities, and residential secondary schools. The Educational Talent Search program, designed to identify bright youngsters and encourage them to continue their education beyond high school, was created soon after as a supplement to Upward Bound.

In the current fiscal year, about fifteen educational talent search projects in Texas, Arizona, California, New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Oregon and Montana are assisting Mexican American youth who aspire to obtain a higher education.

Until now, however, there was still one essential kind of support missing; it was finally supplied by a new categorical program--Special Services for Disadvantaged College Students. This was included as part of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968. This new program, for which intial funding of ten million dollars is being requested in FY 1970, is designed to help institutions of higher education to provide special supportive services--tutoring, counseling and the like--for so-called "high risk" students who have been admitted to college under a more flexible admissions standard.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 also provide for the transfer of Upward Bound from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education effective July 1, 1969,

links all three programs--Talent Search, Upward Bound, and Special Services--into a conceptual and organizational whole.

It would be difficult to overstate the importance of these new developments. For the first time we have the tools to make a real break-through in creating local opportunity programs that will be truly comprehensive from the viewpoint of the minority-group student.

Individual institutions and groups of institutions, will be able to design and operate programs specifically geared to a nearby city. Such programs could combine:

1. A Talent Search project (perhaps operated in cooperation with community groups) which will identify potentially college-able youngsters while they are still in high school.

2. An Upward Bound program, operated under the aegis of one or more of the cooperating institutions, which can help to prepare the identified students for a higher education experience beginning in the summer before their senior year.

3. A joint agreement among cooperating institutions to admit all successful graduates of local Upward Bound programs.

4. A Special Services program, again operated on a cooperative basis, to help insure that these students, once admitted, will have a fighting chance to be successful.

5. A Student Financial Aid program, where possible involving advance committment of support, to provide the student with the resources his individual situation seems to require.

The possibilities for creative cooperation at the local level--among college and universities, community groups, city government, and local industry--are almost endless. A consortium of institutions might well forge a link with the local Model Cities program in an effort to increase higher educational opportunities for children of a specific neighborhood.

There are other Office of Education Programs which, imaginatively used, can also relate to the problem of increasing higher educational opportunity.

The very program in which we are participating today is being funded as a special project under this legislation. Here

are a few other examples of recently funded proposals for training personnel to work in the area of higher educational opportunity:

A Teacher-Training Program for the Disadvantaged Indian American and Mexican American.

An Institute for Junior College Teachers of Disadvantaged Students from Urban Ghettos.

A Media Institute for College Faculty in Programs for Academically Deprived College Students.

A Training Program for College Personnel Serving Disadvantaged Students.

Even older, more established programs can be used for helping the so-called high-risk student. It is apparent, for example, that there is a dire shortage of financial support for the less-than-top-quality, educationally-disadvantaged student in graduate school and a consequent great absence of minority group students at that level of education.

Before closing, I should note that the Office of Education encourages the submission of institutional proposals--under any of its categorical aid programs--which show the substantial involvement of students in the planning and/or operation phases, as may be appropriate. Such involvement is particularly important in these programs which are designed to increase higher educational opportunity through organized efforts in the areas of recruitment, preparation, and retention. It has been shown that successful black, brown, and red students are often more effective than anyone else in relating to younger men and women with whom they share a large body of experience.

We are all aware that there are many who would slow the movement toward higher educational opportunity which is now manifesting itself on campuses throughout the country. There is, in fact, little doubt that the influx of culturally different students may result in some painful adjustments for institutions which have in some cases remained fundamentally unaltered for all too many years. But the winds of change are already blowing; and in my view, those institutions which fail to grasp the opportunity for self-renewal will invite the harsh judgment of history. For this society--if it is going to survive--will have to make progress toward developing a new kind of cultural diversity that can replace the time-worn concept of the melting pot. The impetus for such a movement can come only from the young men and women--of all races and ethnic groups--who will be the opinion makers of tomorrow.

What kind of higher education is it that does not give them the opportunity to know and understand their fellow man? What kind of university is it that does not dare to open a dialog with those groups of Americans which have been denied a voice for so many generations?

I want to believe that our colleges and universities will not turn back from the goal of equal opportunity they have only so recently begun to pursue; that they will in the end choose conscience over tradition; and that ultimately an open and renewed system of higher education will lead the nation a little closer to the fulfillment of her still elusive dream.

SELECTED REMARKS

Dr. Uvaldo Palomares
Human Development Training Institute
San Diego, California

I think we all are very much aware that the problem of not enough Mexican Americans finishing their higher education does not start at that level. I think we can all agree that it starts as the child enters school as the child confronts the culture at large. The elementary and secondary schools, in a way, are very much responsible for the stifling, for the lack of action and lack of programs that would allow the Mexican American student to continue on or the Chicano student to continue in higher education,--that after he takes the test he will be able to predict how well he is going to do in a college and university. I am not yet ready to throw out tests. But at the same time I think as far as they are concerned with the Mexican American, they are useless. As I have gone through all of them, I found, they are better than chance, that they are better than teacher opinion, that they are better than an opinion of a counselor when it comes to the measurement of children who have a background similar to one used on the norms used on the test. If you take middle class Anglo children or students going into college, if you take this group, you are going to find that these tests do work. However, I found that if I take a group of Mexican American students who are going to go to college and I use the same tools and the same instruments--guess what I am going to find? I am going to find that the opinion of people beats the test. I am going to find that if you take a look at the record in the past, it beats the test. I am going to find that most measures we have today for admitting kids to college do not work with Mexican American students. We are finding that many times those individuals who did well on tests, are not particularly the ones that end up in leadership roles, that sometimes the measurement of the test can work in just the opposite way.

So the predictability of tests as we know them now is minimal. And right now I can honestly say I am much more comfortable with the opinions of people from the community, with opinions of good teachers and the opinions of different people being used for predictive devices in colleges.

I feel there are two essential things that have to be done:

1. All counselors in high schools should have to be hit very hard with exactly what the Mexican American is; this means counselor education in the universities and colleges throughout California and in a very strong and powerful way.
2. I would like to see counselor education programs, that before anybody could graduate in California, they have to take a course on the Mexican American student and his particular problems associated with the type of environment he comes from.

The next thing is this, that when and if the Mexican American does get into college and starts taking courses, that those teachers teaching them, people who will be working as instructors in the colleges, receive some orientation concerning the style and method of communication of the Mexican American. Right now what is happening is sometimes very barbaric. We admit a group of Mexican or Chicano students into the college and we turn them loose in a school where the people they're going to don't have the vaguest idea what is going on. I would like to end my comments by saying; I'm not talking about giving them special consideration that would be inappropriate to their particular needs. I think that in education we work with individuals and individual needs. Yet, I have an individual who is particularly bright, who is particularly more capable in my classroom in college; I work with mostly graduate students and I would like to give that person special assignments or special consideration so that he can go ahead and learn way beyond the others. On the other hand, if I have an individual in my class who is having trouble with what I am saying, who is having trouble communicating with me for some reason, I also like to give that individual special consideration to try and reach him and bring him out. I think that up to now one of the biggest mistakes has been, that we will make special communicative efforts with anybody as long as the problem is not associated with being a Chicano or being Black. If there is a problem associated with their ethnic background then we say, "Don't give him special consideration because you're showing favoritism."

I would like to think that sooner or later college professors on the junior college, college, and university level would become keenly aware that they are not showing

favoritism by dealing with particular needs of different groups but they are actually doing the job they should have been doing all along. They're not doing anybody any favors; they're just doing what they're getting paid for and what they should have been doing all along. Ethnicity is not a reason to cut off communication.

ADDRESS

Philip Montéz
Regional Director, Los Angeles
United States Civil Rights Commission

WILL THE REAL MEXICAN AMERICAN PLEASE STAND UP

When one examines the role of the Mexican American in education, one is also looking at the role of the Mexican American in the total society. For what happens to Mexican Americans in the schools will continue to be their role outside. It cannot continue to be the same role allotted to the Mexican American in the past. I personally refuse to accept that Mexican Americans can survive and graduate from our educational institutions only by having them become tanned Anglos. But if we sincerely try to see what the Mexican American brings to schools and utilize that, we would be stimulating educational systems to create a new exciting person--the real Mexican American, a truly bilingual, bicultural person who epitomizes the best of two cultures, who, incidentally has existed since the coming of the gringo to the Southwest, not because of the system but in spite of it. As Harold Howe, past Commissioner of Education, said:

> "Mexican Americans are one of the few exceptions to this American rule of cultural elimination through cultural disdain. A distinctive Spanish-Indian-Mexican culture survives in the United States."

We have to develop a frame of reference, a frame of mind, which takes in the total personality of the Mexican American. I, for one, am perturbed that I am constantly being tabbed as an immigrant. If we look at the history of the Southwest, the status of the Mexican American as an immigrant is not realistic. The Southwest has been and will continue to be a cultural extension of our Latin neighbors to the south, especially Mexico. We are never going to eliminate that influence. Oh, I am sure that there are ways of doing it, if we took a big pair of scissors and cut Mexico off and sent it floating into the Pacific. Or we might build a fifty foot wall and every time a Mexican tried to talk with somebody on the other side we might shoot him. Then we could begin to eliminate the cultural and linguistic influence of the people to the south of us. There are 260 million people south of the Mexican border, 260 million people who speak Spanish; and I have my doubts that if we went

south and told them that English was the only language--nos iban a decir ha donde nos fueramos. This is not only historical reality, but cultural and linguistic reality, which will always exist. I repeat that in spite of the system, the Mexico Americano in the Southwest will always be bilingual and bicultural regardless of those of us who become assimilated, in spite of the system whose purpose seems to be the assimilation of everyone.

Several times I have heard students elaborate on the all important Mexicanismo of the Mexican American. I disagree with the youth movement today on one point--their interpretation of history--it may be a part of the generation gap because I am twenty-two and they are in their teens. But one thing which I found in researching the history of the Mexican American was the impact of the gringos. The inferior status which was given to the Mexican American was accepted by the Mexican American. Forced to relinquish much of his overt Mexicanismo, he accepted that inferior status, that same status which many of us are grappling with today within our own personalities. Let us not forget that we are still dealing with the results of this historical event, trying to become Anglicized while at the same time trying to retain our Mexicanismo. One thing which the students overlook is that the acceptance of this inferior status by those Mexican Americans was their way to survive in the Southwest. If they had fought that status, they would have been annihilated. Today, many of us could have been on reservations.

We don't have to kid ourselves about the past; we are all a product of it. When I recall the tears and sorrow which my parents absorbed as Mexicanos who couldn't understand the system; when I remember what they went through because they couldn't give me the necessary tools to deal with the society, I also remember that they encouraged me to try to get "in". I now remember their efforts, but for years, as many of us did, I rejected them--the older generations--as not really understanding that the Mexicano did not want to accept the role which he was given; but he had no alternative if he wanted to survive. I think that it is important for us to understand, for in many ways the young people are stressing a philosophy which borders on cultural vacuum. This emphasis is an important step toward destroying the inferior status given Mexican Americans, but we can't exist only on our heritage of 500-1,000 years ago.

Ironically, as I listen to many militants, and others in the community, I am not hearing Mexico Americanos; I am hearing Rap Browns and Stokeley Carmichaels, who say that they are Mexicanos. For example, "Tío Tomas" in Spanish is a phrase of endearment, "Mí tío Tomas". You can't literally translate from Uncle Tom to Tío Tomas. It just doesn't have the impact. We see that even

the young people speak with the vernacular of assimilated people while struggling for their Mexicanismo. But the real Mexican American is very different in many respects.

The ambivalence of what these young people are going through today reminds me of some of the strains I went through. I thought for awhile that I was the only Mexican American attending the University of Southern California, and I began to develop an illusion--man, I said, I must be an exception to all the rules. I am making it. I recall when I graduated that the teacher placement office wanted to send me to a barrio school. I said wait a minute, man, I know I don't own the suit I have on, but I am going to own it in another six payments. I've been through that Mexican thing all my life, why do I have to keep doing it. Again, the conflicts of not knowing myself. I had a bachelor's degree and a general secondary credential and I was ready to become an Anglo. I thought I had all the credentials, but I had forgotten that I still looked like a Mexican.

There was another Chicano on the campus who became involved with a nice blonde, blue-eyed Anglo girl, and who for purposes of this meeting we will say that his name was Martinez. He made the terrible mistake of falling in love, which was no problem until they confronted her father. The father said, "Wait a minute; I can go for the dating stuff, but you are a Mexican, so you can't marry my daughter." So it got to the point that the young man and the young girl said, "We are going to get married anyway." The father offered a compromise: "If you change your name you may marry; you don't really look like a Mexican, it's the name that bothers me." So the poor guy goes to court, goes through the whole ritual, and the judge says, "Your name is now McCrady." He goes to the university and he and I were going all over the campus changing the records--gotta wipe it out. I remember one secretary with whom we spoke while she was changing the record, and she said, "Martinez to what? McCrady!" It was a cultural shock for that gringa girl.

But one thing which always amazed me about Mr. Martinez--McCrady, was that when he was married his parents couldn't even attend the wedding because they didn't speak English. They would have confronted the white world and blown my friend's illusion.

Despite the ritual of name changing, it is my contention, that today Mr. McCrady is still acting like a Mexicano. He changed his name and he did other superficial things, but I bet that gringa is saying, "How come you are acting so much like a Mexican."

That was the era when the system gave the Mexican no other way but to become assimilated. Now, with the student movement the pendulum has swung from one extreme--of the society demanding

that we become assimilated--back to Mexican Americans demanding that they retain their Mexicanismo. I see this step as a reflection of maturing democracy. But it is only a step. It is my contention that neither extreme is going to do one bit of good, because the people who are talking about Mexicanismo articulate in English, act like assimilated Anglos, and make demands like Anglos. So consequently, that isn't our bag. We are not Mexicanos. If we travel to Mexico, we know that the educational system is as monolithic a structure as the Anglo system in this country, only in a different language. On the other hand, is our answer total assimilation? NO! Because total assimilation has tended to destroy the personality that we are--a combination of both--Mexican, American. We can not avoid that even in the barrios today. Families are speaking Spanish, comida de tamales, tortillas, frijoles, etc. But they leave that environment to go to the Anglo society to learn their tricks, and it is a very difficult psychological position for people. It can be self-destructive. Every Mexican American in this room must know what I am talking about because if you haven't gone through the process, brother, you've had it made.

When Dr. Jack Forbes testified before our commission in San Antonio, Texas, he was asked the question by our general counsel, "Why hasn't the Mexican American assimilated in the Southwest?" He answered, "Excuse me sir, but that is the wrong question. Why hasn't the Anglo assimilated?" That is what the problem is.

For now, I am not concerned with the problems of the gringo, but I would like to know why he hasn't produced the educational programs which reflect an awareness of the bilingual, bicultural personality of the Mexican American. In a democracy, it is my contention that no person should have to become assimilated at the expense of his personality. It is self defeating. Mr. Howe has put this concept even more strongly:

> "Our society equates Anglo American origin and Anglo American ways with virtue, with goodness, even with political purity. Other cultures are not merely different; they are inferior. They must be wiped out, not only for the good of the country, but for the good of the child. Not only must he learn to speak English; he must stop speaking anything else."

Is that democracy?

Certainly, in this prevailing atmosphere, school districts in the Southwest are not attuned to doing the job of educating Mexican Americans. We don't have to cite statistics on drop-outs and non-employables to know that. Some professionals with direct

knowledge of the needs of Mexican Americans have looked at programs developed specifically for them. It is their contention and mine, that the programs are superficial, to say the least. Many members of Boards of Education are continually plagued with finances. Since 1965, many new programs have been introduced to the schools financed by the Federal and State governments to supplement and complement local resources, and especially to help minorities. Some of these programs have accomplished much, but a strange thing has happened. If money does not come from outside sources, these programs begin to diminish. It is my contention that if the program is really more than supplemental--actually reaching the students for the first time and producing results, it should be financed by all the resources so that it isn't discontinued if the Federal government says that there is no more money. That is the kind of local commitment which is presently lacking.

Today, when we analyze current research on Mexican Americans done by people who have an Anglo frame of reference, we still see the abortive efforts to anglicize Mexican Americans. Recently, a study was completed at UCLA, the main focus of which was the low aspiration level of the Mexican American. And they proved that it was so. Now everybody is saying, "Up their aspiration level."

I have looked at other research by some leading scholars in the Southwest which also implies that I and people like me lack motivation. Yes, I lack motivation when it comes time to get up in the morning. But the crucial point for Mexican Americans is that no scholars have researched the psychology of what happens to a group when the predominant society spends one hundred years degrading, kicking, segregating, and dehumanizing them. Consequently, they are not given equal educational opportunity. These things which the researchers "discover" such as lack of motivation, low aspirations are not Mexican cultural values. They are standards which occur when people have been degraded to the point that all they know is to isolate themselves and to separate themselves from a system which knows only how to hurt, y como duele. Even the universities which produce our scholars in the Southwest have failed in attempting to know the Mexican American. They continue to place the cart before the horse. They look at motivation and aspiration before they know what society has done to us. By providing superficial programs, the society will never have to acknowledge what it has done to a people's culture in a supposedly democratic society. This indicates to me that in all the things we are trying to do for Mexican Americans, nobody has accepted the fact that the system has not only failed us, but cheated us as well. Nobody is willing to accept that.

The blame always ends up on my back. The blame always ends up on the backs of my mother and my father who lacked the motivation

to send me to school. This is the biggest canard I have ever heard coming out of American research.

Let us look at the results of many of the programs now in the schools. What happens to Mexican Americans when they enter English as a Second Language Programs, bilingual programs? They look around and once again the stereotype is perpetuated. Because the only people in that program are Mexicanos. And they go--ooh, otra vez--and they are caught in a tug-a-war, again. They say to themselves, "This can't be very important because it isn't for the other kids. It can't have too much status; how come only us Chicanos come here?" A true bilingual program is a program for all the citizens of this country, not a superficial one just for Mexicans.

The youth movement today has shown something to us and I hope that some of us who are a part of the generation gap have shown something to them. The students have shown us that the Mexican American personality can pull itself together enough to survive this devastating system which I have talked about. It is my contention, and I say this to the young and the old, that the Mexican American because of his ability to be functional in two societies, the Hispanic as well as the Anglo, has the potential for being the class elite of the Southwest. That's what the Mexican American needs, a superiority complex to overcome the inferior status which was given to him. When this happens, we will be well on our way. The young people are showing us that not as one person but as a group of people--just as some of us who gathered here as students and educators can have a sense of self identity, that I, Felipe Montez, alias Philip Montez, can believe in a democratic society in which I was brought up, that I can be a Mexican American with dignity and self-respect. When we talk about educational programs I want to know what the Administration is willing to do to begin to learn what the Mexican counterpart of me and my children is. When will the schools finally acknowledge that I can't survive in that system if the only demands are that I become blonde, blue-eyed and Anglo. I have to beg and plead that I can't do it. I am happy like this, a little brown, but not too bad; I stayed out of the sun. But this is the only way I can be a total human being.

This acceptance of the Mexican part of me--by me and by others--is not nationalistic. It is a real day-to-day way of life for the people who live it. And this is the contribution to the educational institutions which the Mexican Americans extend with open arms. We bring our superior ability to schools not only for other Mexican Americans but for the total society. All peoples, black, brown, white, yellow, or what ever color, can share in the beauty of being bilingual and bicultural if they want. We are not going to force it down their throats. But we ask them, if they want a piece of it, aquí está.

If they don't, fine. Dr. Edmund Gordon warns us how difficult this interaction will be:

> "Few of us are really able to straddle cultures and to use knowledge of other cultures creatively. Even fewer of us have the capacity to adopt experiences from our own value systems to alien value systems without being patronizing."

As difficult as this is, the Mexican American is willing to go half way.

It is my contention that every person who graduates from high school in the Southwest should speak Spanish and English. We have the natural resources to do it. Mr. Howe commented on this direction by saying:

> "Mexican American children offer their Anglo classmates a great natural teaching resource. It is time we stopped wasting that resource and instead enabled youngsters to move back and forth from one language to another without a sense of difficulty or strangeness."

We saw a program in Webb County, Texas, outside of Laredo. The superintendent, an Anglo, said we have bilingual education for all students. It is not just because we have Mexican Americans in our district, but because we believe that bilingual education is good for all young people. If you go to that district in Webb County, you see black, white, brown spending half a day speaking Spanish and half a day speaking English. The superintendent is developing truly bilingual, bicultural personalities in his district. It is the only real program I have seen.

What does this mean for the future? We as Mexican Americans are very responsible to the society in which we live. We always have been and we always will be. Mexican American is not a political term. America is a political term which means we owe our allegiance to this society; there is no need to go into our war record or anything else to illustrate our allegiance. Culturally, however, we are Mexican American. Will the society give the Mexican American a greater opportunity to make a contribution, in international politics, for example? If Latin America continues to develop the way it is, will the Mexican American who is bilingual and bicultural be able to make a contribution? Mr. Howe thinks that the Mexican American can, especially since the United States has taken on international responsibilities:

> "The notion of cultural superiority has seriously harmed the United States in this century in its dealings with other peoples---In the middle of this century after nearly 150 years of largely ignoring

> the rest of the world, we have lumbered into the family of nations as an international force. A position of international responsibility was thrust upon us, and we were ill-prepared to assume it."

We blew Cuba simply because we did not understand the Latin mind. Prior to the commitments of Castro to communism, we were ambivalent about our role in that revolution. So it was not a revolution of Capitalism and Free Enterprise versus Communism. It was a revolution of people who were hungry in a system that could not feed them. It was only after Castro came to the United States with his Communism, that we cut the ties with Cuba. But we didn't know what was going on before. It is my contention that we don't know what is going on in Latin America now.

So what does this all mean for higher education specifically? As we think about what is happening to the Mexican American in education, I repeat, that assimilation is not the answer. Mexicanismo all to itself is not the answer. The Mexican American can not survive trying to play both ends for the middle. It's impossible. We can't do it.

Young people today can not survive that way. This is the tug-a-war, a tug-a-war which has been going on for the Mexicano for over a hundred years. I don't think that in a democratic society anyone should have to become Anglicized or assimilated. What I do contend is that we must accept the Mexican American as a functional personality who is bilingual, bicultural, who can take the best of two cultures and make a major contribution to this society.

So we hope with the coming of young people to the colleges, with the help of the institutions (with or without their help), with the help of realistic programs in the public schools that we will see emerging the true Mexican American, the real Mexican American whom I mentioned at the beginning. Will the real Mexican Americans please stand up!!

SELECTED REMARKS

Dr. Joseph Michel
Foreign Language Education Center,
The University of Texas at Austin

I would like to give you some of the thoughts that I have had throughout the day. I came to this conference directly from another conference, this one a consortium of professional scholars in Latin American studies. It was an impressive group of scholars who were gathered together to deliberate, without excitement, the weighty issues involved. They debated everything, discussed every single word--and came up with no solutions and no programs. What I have seen today is the exact opposite. This group is very very much alive. Particularly impressive is the dynamism and the interest of the students, a fantastic contrast to the other. This is as it should be. Very impressive, too, are the position papers that I have read. It is this kind of thinking that we need to do if we are to get ahead with the business of improving the educational horizons of ethnic minorities. Mexican Americans, the Chicanos, need this kind of involvement.

Now let me propose to you what is on my mind. It is this: The thing that is needed, basically, is not more ideas, but more power. The way to get power behind us is, first of all, to decide what theorists and what goals unite us, and then get together as a group. You are going to have to get together with the people who can supply carefully thought-out ideas and well planned goals upon which you can all unite. But in order to operate effectively, you also need the strategists. These are the people who are able to tell you when is the right time to act, how you can best accomplish your goals. I see no purpose in crashing through a door or knocking down a wall when it is so easy to turn the knob and open the door. This is the function of the strategists. They are just as necessary as the theorists. But it is the activists who get the involvement of the whole group and create the enthusiasm needed. You need to be clever--you cannot walk flat-footed into a situation and hope to achieve anything. You also need to be united, for unification is really what "La Raza" stands for.

I want to get to another point and I don't know whether to call it bilingualism or biculturalism. The Mexican American who aspires to higher learning in an American college now remembers that he is a bilingual individual. Let us define a bilingual individual as a person who can operate in two cultures. Therefore, a person is not truly bilingual until he is also bicultural. He must be able to operate not only within his native cultural sphere but within the cultural sphere of the nation in which he lives--the campus where he studies. As a matter of fact, Joshua Fishman approaches this by calling it the "Domains of Language" and he maintains that you speak one language in the home, a second language among friends, a third language if you go to business, and yet another language in your school life. Our effectiveness as individuals is sharply limited, though, until we are able to operate in the two cultures, and to rise above the two cultures.

No matter where we go, the judgments on words, on values, on customs, on any number of things that refer to culture are going to be different from one place to the next. The same words have different meanings in Spain and in Mexico. What has to be done is to acquire the language and the culture too. When people ask me about the teaching of Spanish in bilingual schools, I usually say that you have to take the child where he is. Then, you can make him a better individual only if you are willing to take him further along in both cultures to the point where he is superior in both cultures. Take the student where he is and carry him on.

QUESTION: What do you think should go into a Mexican American Studies Program?

ANSWER: (Referred to Dr. Rosaldo)

A Mexican American Studies Program should be set up with two things in mind:

1. Set up the program in Spanish, because most Mexican Americans don't speak Spanish well.
2. Include courses that have to do with Mexico, (Mexican History, Mexican Geography, Literature of Mexico, Architecture of Mexico, etc.), because most Mexican Americans don't know much about their heritage.

The criticism I received from the militant group of Mexican Americans was that I included nothing about the Mexican American. They want courses on the history of Mexican

Americans, sociology of the Mexican American, which we don't happen to have at the university but this is explained to them as a flexible program and as soon as those courses become available we will make additions and substitutions. That course has been divided into three parts: 1. A major that will train you in elementary education so you can go into bilingual programs and so you can go into the grade schools yourselves, and then do your convincing of people there and your understanding of Mexican American children at that age. 2. As a major for a high school teacher, again in case they have bilingual programs or if they have counseling or, in your teaching, do additional counseling. 3. Another major is the plain liberal arts major. I thought I was doing a disservice to the students if I didn't give them another skill such as teaching in the grade school. They will earn a grade school certificate and they will receive a high school certificate at the same time.

QUESTION: Have they worked on developing a bilingual program?

ANSWER: (by Dr. Michel)

The group that we are going to be having in our EPDA Institute is a group of forty-six teachers and teacher aides from K-3 in the United Consolidated School District. The solution to the problems that he had with these children was that of involving the school in a bilingual program. I am not speaking of "English as a Second Language"; I am speaking of <u>bilingual</u>. In other words, a program which would be taught in two languages. I remember that as an experience because Dr. Theodore Andersson, who also is very active in these matters, and I were invited down as consultants. We spent much time on the trip trying to decide how we were going to approach the school board to convince them that they needed a bilingual program. We were preparing our strategy. When we got there, they had a whole fiesta, comida Mexicana, Mariachis--the works. Supper was finished. We retired to the board room. A gentleman turned to us and said, "We want a bilingual program; you tell us what to do." And there went our hours of preparation. They were that attuned to their particular needs. What was then done was to start with the first grade. A program was established in which the subjects were taught in Spanish and English. Let me explain--the same subject was not taught in Spanish, and then in English; rather, some subjects were taught in Spanish and some in English. The following year another grade would be added, and so on until they are now up to the fifth grade. It also includes the Anglo children who are there learning Spanish at the same time.

Later on, I was privileged to visit a classroom at that place. It was about a second grade room, and in it was a boy who was obviously retarded. He was about fourteen and where do you put a retarded boy except down in a lower grade? There he sat while the teacher gave him the story "Caperucita Roja"--and she gave the whole story. You should have seen this boy listening--he was simply spellbound. When she finished, she asked, "¿Quién me puede contar el cuento?" That boy's hand just popped up, and the teacher said, "No, I don't mean in Spanish, I mean in English." The little boy's hand went down and he retired back into his shell. This is the kind of thing that tears you up. My only excuse for the teacher, and I'm sure it's a valid one, was that this was her first year of teaching. She was not yet sensitive to the problem. The thing she should have done at that moment was to say to the boy, "Fine, tell me the story." The language doesn't make any difference at that point. "Tell me the story."

So, this is the kind of program that has been established. Now, this is not to say that there are not any problems, that it is an ideal program, that everything has been solved. You and I know that there will always be problems.

One of the most crucial problems is the question of what materials to use. Do you use a regular book for teaching second grade reading? This sometimes does not do, because readers are not always geared to teach that particular type of student. This is in fact what you've been saying so far at this conference. What we really need are specific materials for our purpose; and before we can have these materials, we need some basic research leading to their preparation. The reason I'm saying this is that it is a propos of the question of testing and of materials--and you know how heatedly we discussed the question of testing.

Now, in our part of the country, bilingualism has been discussed up and down. Whether we coordinate or compound, the degree and the domains of language, all the terminology and the phenomena that accompany it ("transfer", "switch", and so on).

What we have not discussed is this: "Eventually, what does the child speak?" I became involved with this about two years ago. I felt that any solution to problems of materials and testing, must be based on the language the child speaks. We sent out a group of recorders to tape the language of the five year old the year before he enters school; we wanted to find out what these children were speaking. We selected some people near the linguistic

frontier, and some in the interior. We chose people from urban areas, we chose people from rural areas, and we devised a system for eliciting language. You don't go to a child of five and expect him to start a conversation with you. We had to devise techniques that would elicit language more subtly than this. We recorded seventy-five hours of language which I envisioned as a beginning project to be called "Spanish of the Southwest." Unfortunately, the funding we got enabled us to do only a pilot testing within the border towns of Southern Texas, and a few in the interior areas of Central Texas. It didn't even get as far West as El Paso. It did serve to provide enough data for a doctoral dissertation, which provided some very interesting little facts. For example, none of our children interviewed knew the words "king", "queen", "prince", "princess" in either Spanish or English, so we could surmise that they did not know the fairy tales. On the other hand, there was one word they all knew--it was the word "T. V." We looked it up in the word list of Keniston, Buchanan, and Bou, and the word wasn't there. What we were dealing with was the spoken language, which is the proper approach to any child. They were used to the language they knew. Yet people who make textbooks reverse the process and say, "Okay, is this in the frequency word list of Keniston?" They then create a whole exercise maybe to develop that word. What is needed is relevance in materials, just as lack of relevance is the key to our criticism of testing programs. I could test in Chinese and score absolutely nothing, because I don't know Chinese. The test is irrelevant to my background--e.g., the testing has failed to find out what I do know. The kind of test that is needed is one that explores what I do know.

We hope eventually to be able to extend our study into New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, and California. When that is done we will have a picture of the language. We will be able to analyze the things that the child is saying and determine how to work with him.

SELECTED REMARKS

David Johnson
Educational Opportunity
Grants Branch,
United States Office of Education

I think Congress has received more mail on the reduction of educational opportunity grants, student loans, and college work-study grants than they have received on any issues in a long, long time. People are writing about these cutbacks to their Congressmen, and to the President. We have legislation that goes all the way across the board. We have Student Financial Aid Programs, Talent Searches, Upward Bound, and we've got Special Services, among many others.

But there are no substantial appropriations for any of these programs. For example, the Educational Talent Search program, which is one of the three I am responsible for, has $3.7 million with which to cover the entire country this year. At the same time we received 255 proposals that came from all parts of the country urgently requesting a total of $8.5 million. It's a question of assigning priorities to the most worthwhile programs and to the most able persons. The program that René Nuñez is running is a good illustration--that program is growing and has had to have more money each year. And as we increase those that have proven their worth, it has meant that fewer funds are there to support new ones. It also means that many applicants may have submitted a proposal three years in a row, and have not yet been funded. "Why?" they ask. The answer is that the money just is not there. I hope those of you who are looking at, or are close to other Talent Search proposals, will look very carefully at them and let us know when they are poor programs, or are not doing their job. Because we and they do make some mistakes--it is very easy to make mistakes in selecting people. When we get a piece of paper asking for money to do this and this and this we must find surefire ways of finding out how wide gap there is between what people want to do and what they actually can put into effect. Very often people who yearn to go out and help kids get into college just can't put it into action. Very often professional people on faculties perceive this search as most

educators are likely to do; they can't know that it takes more than sitting in an office and being academic, hoping that somehow this will have some magic effect on kids. It won't. You have to get out in the street and out into the community. Our experience has been that these approaches to implementing programs are not as successful as putting this money into agencies already operating in the community and into the kids, and letting them hire other kids to help carry out the program. After all, kids seem to be the best recruiters of the whole lot of us. We learned that the best people to talk to young peole about what there is ahead for them are other young people who have started down that road.

I would like to talk to you about the Special Services programs. Among them is a program called Special Services for the Disadvantaged Student, a program created only last year by the Congress, but so far it hasn't been funded. Our responsibility is to write the guidelines and regulations, and get those out so that institutions of higher education can respond by submitting proposals to us between next October 1st and November 1st. Prior to this, we hope, Congress will act on the appropriations, possibly during September or October. This would make the money available for that program by the first of January. We anticipate a $10 million request for this year. That won't do the whole job, but it will be a start, and should get the program off the ground.

Now when we decided that our first step was to write these guidelines for the projected programs we called on a specialist from Northern California to act as chief consultant to help ramrod the thing. This was a woman who had run the College Readiness Program at the College at San Mateo.

Although she was not available to join us full-time, she did help us to write an original document and to structure an organization. We called in twenty-three consultants to sit around a table with us for three days and talk about what this program should be. In the group were specialists from Long Beach State College, the Teacher Corps in Fresno, some Chicanos, some Puerto Ricans (two from the East Coast), the Indians, Americans, Blacks and a smattering of Whites. We have insisted, if we can get them approved by the Office of Education, the special services projects that exist on the campuses are there to create an environment that enables minority-group and low income kids to go through the institutions with dignity. Many things have to be introduced into this program before we can create this special environment--such things as including students on the governing board of the project, having on the boards people from the communities represented by the low income students, as well as adults

from the college community. Also sitting on that committee must be representatives of faculty and administrators. There are functions that can be performed by people who do not have all of the credentials. People in the community can also help as advisors on financial aid committees. We also suggested that students could perform valuable services on financial aid committees and as recruiters. Someone should be hired to serve as an advocate for students who need counsel or representation when complaints arise against the establishment. When the cafeteria worker throws the food on the tray of some and not of others that "advocate" is there to deal with the cafeteria worker and make him understand that his conduct is not any longer acceptable or when a professor refuses to acknowledge ethnic or cultural standards or attitudes, the advocate is there to say, "You can't do this, you have to understand this student." He may also say to the student, "You go back to the class and learn."

These are just a few of the guidelines that we hope to get blessed by the powers that be. Some people have reacted violently to our guidelines, saying, "You are too specific; you describe too clearly what the program is to be. Why don't you be more vague and general?" Most program guidelines coming out of Washington have been as vague and general as could possibly be devised. A wonderful example is the Opportunity Grants Program and I know that you all wonder why this program went the way that it did. I feel very strongly, for I was its Chief for two and a half years. Never at any time was the purpose of the program clearly defined. In 1959, the National Defense Education Act was passed and in it was a loan program we called NDSL. Many of you are probably indebted to it, as many of us are. At the outset, it stipulated that the many students who would be given special attention were those with special academic ability. That established immediately who was going to get most of the loans. In 1964, in the Economic Opportunity Act, a College Work-Study Program was created. It was put into operation in the higher education institutions around the country. The first year they couldn't give the money away because there were no poor kids of any color attending the institutions of higher education. So the second year they upped the income guidelines so that you could be from a middle-income family and get that college work-study money. In 1965, the Higher Education Act created the Educational Opportunity Grants Program, which delighted the many people who had desired a workable grant program. They saw in this, at last, an answer to their needs. This program, though soon went trailing right behind the other two programs and wound up serving the middle income people. Again, no income guidelines had been applied.

In closing, I have touched lightly on some of the profound questions we must find answers for: How do we make things change? Where is power? Why do we always have to put students out on the front line to get their heads bashed in? (I think that is basically what René Nuñez was talking about.) Why don't some of the rest of us step forward and get our heads bashed in, instead? We have been very critical of administrators on college campuses. Yet, I wonder how many college administrators have been done in because faculties have sat down and said, "This is as far as we are willing to go." Very often professors point the way for the rest of the world to change, but have you ever tried to get them to change themselves? Just try it sometime. I wonder if we shouldn't start by saying to them: "O. K., man, there are 500 of you and there is one president and he can talk to the Congressman and be listened to. There are the things we think you ought to go and say to him. Maybe it doesn't do any good for one president to go say something to one Congressman. Nevertheless, here in this group you've got 600 good guys with a mission, and some more good guys back of you. Maybe you should start right here putting your questions and programs on the line.

BUS TOUR OF THE HARBOR AREA

One of the objectives of the conference was to bring Anglo members of the college faculty into closer contact with the Mexican American community. On the afternoon of the first day, participants toured the Los Angeles Harbor area, which is predominantly Mexican American. Guides from the United Mexican American Students, pointed out the community educational and social institutions.

At the Wilmington Park Elementary School, Miss Josephine Valdez gave a demonstration of bilingual teaching. The class was ungraded, on two levels. Beginning students had just arrived from Mexico and knew little or no English. Others had some previous school experience. There was a demonstration of materials used in bilingual education. This was one of the few bilingual classes in a predominantly Mexican American area.

At a Skills Center, Mr. Otolio Barron, Co-ordinator and Counselor, explained how 180 trainees learned to be machinists and combination welders. They also learned practical English in classes in English as a Second Language. Students demonstrated their skills in welding. There was a demonstration of activities carried on in the Center and an opportunity to talk with the trainees.

The tour continued to the office of Mr. Benito Esparsa, Immigration Counselor, who explained how recent immigrants to the area have great difficulty in communication and how his office helped them with legal problems, preparation of income tax forms, employment applications and problems of unemployment and workers' compensation.

Miss Vera Valdez, of the NAAP Center (Neighborhood Adults Participation Program), explained how the Center carried out its tasks in five major areas: Consumer Education, Job Development, Education, Social Welfare, and Community Improvement. This Center thus helped to involve the community with professional workers in programs of self-help and self-improvement. In this same area the conferees visited stores catering almost exclusively to the Mexican Americans, The Holy Family Parish, and a social hall.

The only high school in the neighborhood was Banning High School, built many year ago. Participants saw the

neighborhood with the physical features of poverty and limited opportunity for employment. The tour ended at the Filipino Hall, where conferees met with members of the Mexican American community for a Mexican American dinner. The evening concluded with discussion that indicated the scope of the problems that would be discussed the next day.

SUGGESTIONS TAKEN FROM GENERAL SESSION

The following brief excerpts will give an idea of the types of thoughts expressed by various leaders at the Conference. They are not intended to be a Conference outline, but to refresh the memory of those who attended and suggest to readers the nature of the special concerns and problems of those concerned with Mexican American students.

Armando Rodriguez
U.S. Office of Education

Problem with non-identifying groups

No matter how we are there will always be group dynamics; group involvement, cultural identity, individuals, and group pride.

We will always identify: we need to understand that; and need to overcome the mythical persons or groups or individuals that we have been using to identify the Mexican American for years (by insensitive romanticists). We need a new image to identify with. We need to tell what the group really looks like--not negating the individual.

We need to weigh who we are, where we are, and where we fit in terms of true light and not in terms of romanticism--that's the real danger.

Look at the experiences and frame of reference of people who have to interpret feelings of the people, and begin to work with them.

Tests that are being used are irrelevant and we must begin to teach the ones that are relevant.

Dr. Tom Carter
University of Texas at El Paso

Examine the problems of conflict between counselors and counselor aides.

Chicano students who get involved with sensitizing counselors might merely perpetuate the sterotype that already exists. Mexican American Culture and Mexican American glorification of the culture must be considered.

Dr. Tom Carter (Continued)

Often the counselors get an individual Mexican American and treat him as abnormal because he is not like the counselor--perhaps this creates a bigger problem.

Edward Casavantes
Southwestern Co-operative Educational
Laboratory, Albuquerque

Psychology classes and psychological testing are in disrepute. What we need is the reassessment of them.

What do these psychological tests really measure?

Counselors should be taught to re-interpret them

Lower class youngsters interpret and think about tests in a completely different way - tests are meaningless to them.

Very little in substance or content is talked about on the sociology of the Mexican American. The middle barrier of being middle class and being Chicano is completely neglected. The teachers and counselors need to be taught about the poor.

Sensitizing teachers and counselors needs to be done on a very high level and with consultation of sophisticated behavioral scientists.

Counselors must be trained to be experts for Chicanos: to counsel poor people you must be trained at the intensity of a Ph.D.; culture and people must be understood.

Significant programs in the area of training individuals must be developed (four weeks of seminars and sensitivity programs are not going to do the job).

Dr. Manuel Guerra
Professor of Spanish, CSCLB

Criteria in counseling Mexican American Students

Spanish should be used as a professional tool
Teachers and counselors should use the Spanish language with Spanish speaking students.

Teachers and counselors should have professional training in speaking the Spanish language so as to be effective in counseling and teaching.

Dr. Manuel Guerra (Continued)

One of the important features of this conference and future conferences will be the participation of the students, not simply as bystanders and spectators but as participants and contributors. We can gain wisdom and insight from what UMAS is saying.

Tests have been built to exclude rather than include students. They have not brought students into the learning process but assume that the student is not capable of being a valuable learner.

There are three ideas that this group should react to:

1. The term "bilingual" or "bicultural" is misleading in reference to the Chicano student. We tend to consider Mexican American students as bilingual. The bilingual and bicultural student should be accredited and acknowledged as a student of talent in the humanities. His proficiency should be recognized as part of his work for a degree.

2. There is a need for more financial aid for students from the barrio, and for admission of greater numbers of needy students to college.

3. We need to take a second look at so-called "academic standards." We need innovations in curricula to meet the needs of the Mexican American students. We need new standards to evaluate the ability of the Mexican American student. Mexican American students do not need a remedial tutorial program in college; what they need is a program that is more realistic in terms of their background, their assets and abilities and their particular interests.

Sam Paz, President, UMAS
California State College at Dominguez Hills

You don't have to be a psychologist to communicate with a Chicano and to understand him--credentials are not that necessary.

New concepts are needed to be developed for counseling.

The concept is not to analyze the psycho-dynamics of the Mexican American--if a person can hold his own as a student, admit him without testing.

WORKSHOPS

Following the presentation and general sessions, workshops were held to bring the conferees into more intimate discussions of the problems of the conference. They were divided into three groups: faculty and students, administrators and students, and counselors and community. The results of the workshops are presented here in outline form to give an overall view of the problems and issues which were discussed. The deliberations of the workshops resulted in the resolutions presented and passed on the last day of the conference.

WORKSHOP #1 Faculty and Students

I. RECRUITMENT
   - A. Educating parents in education of their children
   - B. Bring parents to campus and participate in dialogue, question and answer sessions

II. TESTING
   - A. Devise new tests
   - B. Eliminate all testing
   - C. Keep testing but re-evaluate counselors, possible Chicanos, especially in high school
   - D. Students should be accepted on basis of merits, g.p.a. is not always a valid criterion
   - E. Testing is used to:
     1. label
     2. stereotype
     3. segregate
     4. place students in disadvantageous positions
   - F. We should consider the psychological feeling towards testing
   - G. Graduate Record Exam should be scrutinized and Mexican Americans should establish criteria based on other factors
   - H. Students and Counselors who are highly motivated are preferred as counselors

III. COUNSELING
   - A. Teachers should be available for counseling, five hours of teaching instead of six. Hours should be flexible. The student can go to the teacher or a counselor he can relate to.
   - B. Have 1,2,3, day National conference in California to counsel, guide, and advise only Chicano students.
   - C. Counselors should hear the student talk about the problems he or she faces. If the counselors cannot advise Chicanos let their fellow students do it.

D. Students need an office where they can counsel Chicano students on the college campus.
E. College Counseling Center for Chicanos in schools. In the center there should be a rotation of hours so that someone is always there.
F. Work-Study money for Chicano students to act as counselor aides, work with counselors at high school and college level
G. Resources for counseling
   1. United Mexican American Student (UMAS)
   2. Chicano teachers--2 to 3 hours to counsel.
H. Changes on local level should be expanded to national level.
I. Regional meeting of Mexican American students, agency funded, to talk about problems.

IV. TRACKING
A. Testing should not be used for tracking
B. 46% of all students in Far West are tracked in the first grade
C. 39% of Mexican American students are tracked in the first grade

V. NATIONAL SCHOLARSHIP FOUNDATION FOR MEXICAN AMERICANS
A. United Mexican American Students (UMAS) should set up guidelines for these proposals
B. United Mexican American Students should work with parents and community (in counseling)

VI. CONFERENCE
A. Should be a conference before school starts with parents and children--UMAS and MAYA should set it up.

WORKSHOP #2 Administrators and Stude...

I. GOALS OF WORKSHOPS
A. Unifying communities, in regard to student organizations, college problems
B. Explore manner in which programs are funded
C. Question of admissions
   1. process of recruiting
   2. process of retention
D. Selection of institution and selection of career
E. Direct financial grants. Problems of present financial aid in terms of long-term aid.
F. Recruitment of proper staff and faculty, including retention, orientation, and training
G. Mexican American Studies programs

II. COMMUNITY DISCUSSION
A. Tentative definitions of *Mexican American community to serve within this discussion: Who is the Mexican

* Matter of why certain groups did not attend the conference.

American? Question of definition. Mexican American population within a certain radius of the college campus.

B. Any major change must involve the Mexican American community."To help the Chicano who needs help" the total community must be involved--including the Anglo community.
   1. Without total involvement financing, education, and politics will not relate
   2. Students with community support can apply mild pressure to receive their desires

C. How can the unsympathetic community be sensitized toward the problems? Communication between all groups must be established to create the needed awareness and sensitivity.

D. Recommendation: That present administrators return to their particular campuses and set up meetings between students, administration, and the community concerning problems pertinent to all.

III. ADMISSIONS

A. The community can help in recruitment of Chicano students by recommendations

B. Admission problems: concerns the irrelevancy of existing tests

Pro-Tests:
   1. Test to help weed out students (those who will "fail" potentially).
   2. Separate testing argued against.

Con Tests:
   1. Are grades in high school and the testing system a reflection of potential? Migrant kids of the Southwest primarily have been succeeding in colleges in a special program though many times they did not finish high school.

C. Recommendation: Until a valid and effective test for college success is developed, it is recommended that other methods of selection be included to a stronger degree, such as teachers' recommendations, counselor recommendation, and other accessments of student potential.

IV. FINANCING AND ADMISSIONS

Problem: Only two institutions present represent admissions, follow-up programs, and financial aid

A. Poor people are often headed into junior colleges: why not into the universities?
   1. The question of money often does not allow one to go somewhere other than a junior college
   2. Financial aid is available for those who do not want to attend junior colleges

3. Junior colleges prepare students for more advanced college work, although such preparation is not always necessary.

B. Support from this conference is needed for the establishment of a Mexican American department in the National Scholarship Service, Inc.

C. Do we have the right to deny a person access to a public institution? An extreme test would do so

D. In regard to the success of Chicanos in college:
   1. Intermediate training (College Readiness Program) helps Chicanos succeed in college
      a. For instance, regular college units are earned at San Mateo College in the College Readiness Program
      b. 1-1 relationship in tutoring program
      c. teaches students how to manipulate the college situation
   2. At UCLA tests are completely thrust aside (in a pilot program) After the program began showing results, it was found that by the second quarter all had passed their classes, even though 74 out of 100 had dropped out of high school

WORKSHOP #3 Counselor and Community

I. Recommendation for Confrontation of
   A. counselors and students. Student evaluation of counseling and counselors.
      1. Ten conferences with 200 counselors to meet with 100 students per conference, which will be held in California and will be Federal funded.
      2. Conference will be held in the ghetto area.
      3. Attendance of counselors will be absolutely necessary.
      4. Students will be paid to attend.
      5. Conference will be forty hours long. Both students and counselors could get together to bring out communication between both.
      6. Preference will be for junior colleges and state colleges.

II. Recommendation to modify or broaden the qualifications for certified counselors.
   A. Students pick their own counselors on the local level.
      1. The counselor should be a person the students could relate to.
      2. College students or organizations should go back and counsel students in high school systems.
      3. Counseling in community--members of the adult community could counsel students

4. Every school could have group counseling
   a. to work with students outside of school picture
   b. Work with individual counseling
5. Counseling does not have to be from a Chicano but people that are involved, and can relate to the Chicano's needs.

III. Education Personnel Development Act--EPDA
   A. Workshop--Sensitivity Training for all counselors:
      1. Resolution #1 (Adopted Amendment), May 17, 1969 that the local, state, and federal government provide funds for the establishment of college counseling centers and employ Mexican American students as counselors for the purpose of working with elementary, junior, and senior high school, junior college, and college students in order to effectively involve more Mexican American students in higher education.

WORKSHOP #3 NOTES

Resolved that:

I. EPDA Chicano Sensitivity Workshops on counseling be set up in the Southwest, 10 in California, providing for 40 hours of workshop activity, including encounter groups, competent Mexican American facilitators and participants from all levels of schools. It was recommended that junior colleges and high schools be assigned priority in the development of these workshops. It was recommended that counselors be required to attend training sessions.
   Content:
   A. Mexican American culture: History, Sociology Family Life
   B. Language, Folklore, Culture of Poverty, Religion
   C. Reassessment of Counselor role: testing, visitation, information center, college advisement, recruitment of counselor candidates, community involvement, family counseling, counselor training, and student counseling aids

II. Chicano students be assigned as counselors for students, college students for high school students. Student counselors are to be paid from college work study funds allocated for this purpose.

III. More counselors be assigned to the elementary schools, recognizing the need for more counseling with students and families of students at the elementary level.

IV. Counseling be taken into the community, establishing community counseling centers, with an informal setting.

V. Requirements for the assignment of Chicano counselors be broadened, eliminating the artificial barriers of accreditation, and resulting in the "natural selection" of counselors.

VI. There be student evaluation of both counseling and counselors.

VII. Sensitivity training be required of all counselors.

VIII. Insensitive counselor candidates be screened out at the college training level.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY CONFERENCE

May 17, 1969

WORKSHOP #1

Resolution #1 — Faculty and Students

The system for tracking students has shown to be biased and unfair to the Mexican American student (46% of all students are tracked in the first grade. 38%-39% of Mexican Americans are tracked in the first grade).

We demand the abolition of the present and very common practices of rigid ability or homogenous grouping (tracking) as being detrimental to the Mexican American students' achievement, personal development and the pursuance of higher education.

Resolution #2

The utilization of "Clearing Houses" in California has proven to be an excellent source for recruitment of Mexican Americans into Higher Education.

This conference recommends that "Clearing Houses" be established in all of the predominantly Mexican American communities throughout the United States, that these "Clearing Houses" be operated by Mexican Americans; and that the guidelines presented by René Nuñez in his position paper prepared for this conference be followed.

Resolution #3

Financial aid is one of the greatest problems facing the Mexican American student.

Resolved: that this Conference urge the establishment of a National Mexican American Scholarship Foundation as recommended in the position paper prepared by United Mexican American Students at California State College at Long Beach.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY CONFERENCE

WORKSHOP #2

Resolution #1 — Administrators and Students

The existing programs of federal financial aids to students are administered primarily through institutions of higher education and since such a procedure for administering financial aids limits a student's choice of educational institutions, and since precedent exists for establishing programs of federal financial grants and loans to special groups with due regard for the desires of the individual members thereof: namely, the GI Bill of Rights;

Resolved: that appropriate amendments to existing legislation be presented to the Congress of the United States to provide for direct financial aids to students so as to permit them to choose the institutions they wish to attend, thus increasing their opportunities to receive the kind of education best suited to their interests and abilities.

Resolution #2

Existing standardized tests, such as SAT and ACT, have proven invalid for the selection of Mexican American students for educational institutions beyond the high school level.

Resolved: that these college admissions tests be replaced by a combination of such other methods as the applicant's self-assessment, and the recommendations of teachers, counselors, student peers, and representatives of community and private agencies, such as boy's and girl's clubs, Youth Opportunity Groups, college clearinghouses and other Talent Search Projects. It is further resolved that testing agencies should seek new methods of assessing student potential.

Resolution #3

There is a need for a national scholarship program established especially for Mexican Americans,

Resolved: that this Conference call upon its advisory committee to develop plans for such a program beginning with research into the kinds of private and public financial aid programs presently available to Mexican Americans in all parts of the country.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY CONFERENCE

WORKSHOP #2 (Continued)

Resolution #4

The success of institutions of higher learning in recruiting, teaching and retaining Mexican American students depends upon many factors outside the scope of the institutions themselves,

Resolved: that university administrators take the necessary steps to involve student groups and especially the Mexican Americans and their organizations, in all educational programs affecting the recruiting, training and retention of Mexican American students - and that no new programs be undertaken until after thorough consultation and free exchange of information and ideas with representatives of the Mexican American community.

WORKSHOP #3

Resolution #1 Counselors, Administrators and Students

Resolved: that the local, state, and federal government provide funds for the establishment of college counseling centers and employ Mexican American students as counselors for the purpose of working with elementary junior, senior high schools, junior college, and college students in order to effectively involve more Mexican American students in higher education.

Resolution #2

Resolved: that community Advisory Committees be set up, composed of parents of students enrolled in the college, to monitor the student recruitment, retention and assistance programs of the college, and that such a committee be selected by the student organizations on the campus.

Resolution #3

Resolved: that colleges and universities should strive to enroll larger numbers of Mexican American students so that the proportion of these students in the college population should reflect at least the minimum of representation in the community.

RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY CONFERENCE

Resolution #4

Resolved: that the federal government publish and distribute information on the amount of money provided for student assistance that is returned by each institution of higher learning at the end of each fiscal year and that the distribution of this information be so designed to reach the parent and student population of the individual college.

Resolution #5

Most California colleges and universities are committed to establishing Mexican American Studies programs. There is no model for initiating such programs and many of the courses are experimental.

Resolved: that funds from public and private sources be made available to contract with scholars to write syllabi of 20-30 pages. The syllabi should include: 1) a course rationale, 2) a course outline, 3) a course bibliography.

Resolution #6

Resolved: that the administrators of the Civil Rights Commission Title VI Program make a statistical study in depth of the participation of minority students in the scholarship programs of higher education.

SELECTED REMARKS - CLOSING ADDRESS

Father Henry J. Casso
Vicar of Urban Affairs
San Antonio, Texas

Last week I had the distinct joy of being part of the youth conference that was sponsored by the UMAS group of the University of Colorado, who raised some $60,000 for their conference. They invited to the campus some 500 students from throughout the state of Colorado and, like you, had as their goal bringing to that campus some 300 Mexican American students this coming year. To do this, they passed out a referendum to 5,000 to 6,000 students on that campus, asking each student to contribute five extra dollars each semester to the cause of getting minorities onto the campus. This technique enabled them to raise some $300,000 which the students of UMAS will utilize for scholarships for young Mexican American students, for tutorial services, and so forth.

Let me just read to you the topics that were dealt with in Colorado. They were: Who You Are, Identity, Success, A Dollar a Day, The Culture of Poverty, What Price Dignity, School on the Streets, The Double Edged Sword, Forward Together, Is the Gate Closed, and the Etiquette of Power.

Can you not see reflected in these same topics some of the things that were heard in this conference in the last three days? The thoughts are very similar. They, too, were trying to come to grips with these awesome issues that confront the Mexican American in higher education.

The week before, at Texas Tech in Lubbock, I had the beautiful experience of being part of that Conference, and again in their faces I beheld the same quest and forward thrust toward quality education. Yesterday and today Mexican Americans from every college and university are meeting in Fort Collins, Colorado, and they too are thinking and coming to grips with the same thing that we have discussed here in Southern California. I should tell you, I have taken the privilege of sending to each of these groups a copy of the twelve magnificent position papers you have prepared here.

As we behold this great forward thrust, I confess that I am greatly disturbed, for I see in these marvelous pressures that are pushing us ever forward in the search for higher

educational opportunity and greater educational achievement, the need for a clear vision of the goals we seek, and a commitment to these goals. As we reflect upon what has been accomplished, it hardly seems possible that this has happened in only two short years. It is hard to believe, isn't it, that our quest for quality education began as recently as two years ago! How spontaneously the quest has been taken up, particularly by the youth. Already in the talk of Armando Rodriguez we hear that we are dealing with an educational institution that is geared to the exclusion of minorities--yet in such a short time the minorities are already trying to become inclusive. Higher education does not yet have the tools, neither does it have the commitment, nor the awareness to be able to shift into another gear. I become disturbed, likewise, because I think I see an awesome reaction beginning to set in that may threaten the student movement across the country, for I can sense a danger--the danger that legitimate requests will be confused with radicalism. I'm beginning to see that the initiative that is being exerted, especially on behalf of youth for improvement, will be misinterpreted as a desire to overthrow the educational system. We have convinced the American people that there was wisdom in providing higher education, and value in assuring that higher education could be obtained by all who desired it. But now we see a trend in the opposite direction--now discouraging accounts of cutbacks; heads of national programs who speak publicly of withdrawal of funds for programs and scholarships; men in high government places who answer our questions about the need for more funding on the national level for the things this organization stands for with a shrug of the shoulders and a far-away look. We see, too, in California the frustration that confronts the would-be student who encounters a proposed increase in university and college tuition. Armando Rodriguez sees the problem and has written a brilliant report for the HEW, about it. Frustrations that are caused by natural design students can tolerate as you and I know. But it is the frustrations that are caused by human design and never resolved are the ones that soon become pressure points. Eventually they must erupt, and the direction the blow-up takes cannot always be determined.

These things you and I know, and we are brought together here by a desire to solve some of our problems. We see that the Mexican American problems in college are related to a lack of program. We see, too a lack of initiative at the elementary level. Did we not hear Dr. Palomares say yesterday that to consider the retention of Mexican Americans on the college campuses requires that we consider the problems, the

ills, the lack of initiative, and the lack of program at the elementary level. I agree whole heartedly.

Let us consider what has been done on this problem. In 1966, the National Educational Association held a conference which reported that the greatest challenge in the Southwest was the improvement of education for the Mexican American child, the bilingual and the bicultural child. The report admitted that educators are aware of the work that has to be done, but do not have the tools whereby that awareness can be put into action. A possible solution, they felt, lay in attacking the problem of language, especially a national thrust on the concept of bilingualism. And for those who are grappling with definitions, we could well define bilingualism educationally as teaching the child (whose home language is different from that of the land) the language of the land in the language of the home. You can see that this immediately applies to the Mexican American.

From that conference we held a state-wide conference in Texas in 1967 on "The Educational Opportunities of the Mexican American". At that conference we resolved that one of the priority goals was the recognition that there was a serious statewide educational problem in relation to the Mexican American, and that this had to be brought to the surface.

In 1968, the National Conference of Educational Opportunities was held in Austin, Texas. An important moment came when Commissioner Harold Howe, in his address on The Cowboy and the Indian, said:

> "I would like to talk about the educational problem and it is basically just one problem; helping every youngster, whatever his home background, whatever his home language and whatever his ability to become all he has in him to become."

What must concern us is that the schools fail to come within a country-mile of that goal, and if Mexican American children have a higher drop out rate than any other identifiable group in the nation--and they do--then the schools can not explain away their failure by belaboring the Mexican American himself. The problem simply is that the schools have failed with these children. The Mexican American in the educational system of this country assuredly has been cheated. He finds himself, and his friends with an eighty to ninety percent drop-out rate. In California it is a fifty percent drop-out rate in the high schools alone, and I understand that California is one of the most enlightened and progressive states in the country as far as education is concerned. But the fact is that for more

than a hundred years, this nation and its educators and its national educational institutions have stood mute while this travesty has been taking place. How many of you, young and old here today, would continue to go to a doctor who has lost eight or nine out of every ten patients? How many of us would go to a lawyer who lost eight or nine of every ten cases? How many corporations would be allowed to continue in business if they came up with an eighty to ninety percent deficit? Yet the nation stands mute, while all but ten or twenty percent of this vast minority has been dropping out of school! Worse yet, these children have thereby been allowed to drop-out of every other institution in American life.

Let us see what educational systems are getting ready to do about it. Armando Rodriguez, in 1968, made a tour of five Southwestern States, and had a total of 101 meetings, speaking to and receiving the observation from 1,765 persons among whom were members of state boards of education, commissioners, and all kinds of community people. As a result of observations made and results recorded during the survey, his conclusions included these:

1. There is a serious shortage of educational programs directed toward the needs of Mexican Americans in all five Southwestern States.
2. A serious problem relates to the transmission of information concerning existing programs in their areas or in adjacent areas.
3. School districts lack imagination in devising or adopting new or innovative programs for Mexican Americans.
4. All communities evinced great interest in doing something about the problem, but lacked a sense of direction and knowledge about what to do.
5. Very few Anglo educators are prepared to handle the educational problems of Mexican Americans.
6. There is a great desire for information about promising educational programs for Mexican Americans.
7. An almost total lack of coordination among federal, state, and local agencies that deal with needs of Mexican Americans creates a critical problem.

The awesome truth is--this is the best that the educational system in the Southwest has done to take care of the problems of Mexican Americans.

Another cause for dismay and grave concern in the last two years is the student walkout across the Southwest. We saw it happen in Los Angeles, in San Antonio, Elsa-Edcouch, Kingsville, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, Tucson and Denver. The youngsters are beginning to realize that they believe in a system, a system that said, "Son and daughter, get a good education, finish your high school and you will be able to compete in the national scene." And all of a sudden the young people are realizing, as they look at their top students, the valedictorians, the salutatorians of their classes, that they can not compete. They, too, have begun to leave the campuses. Though they express it in different terms, they are talking about the very same issues that we have been talking about, ourselves, these two days. You discussed yesterday the need for counselors, for counselors with cariño. You spoke of the need for bilingual education, of the need to be able rather than the ability--the right for the public to speak Spanish on the school grounds, of the need for history so that they can see themselves, and history as it was in the Southwest, a need for an updated curriculum. On the one hand you have the teacher saying, "You're not going to make it, kid," and on the other hand the kids are saying, "We want to be able to compete." They are saying likewise, that the vocational courses to which many of them have been relegated have not been training them with marketable skills.

A greater tragedy occurs when young Mexican Americans think they are getting a good education because they are in high school; there they see, often too late, that the education which they have received is inferior in quality, and one that will not enable them to compete realistically. One can only speak of this historically as "The Great Rape of the Mind," a travesty of American education. We have all stood mute while thousands of young Mexican American children in first grade have been relegated to the mentally retarded classes in the Santa Ana Independent School district. Let us say parenthetically, "God bless Attorney Macias who has taken on that particular problem!"

Our National Advisory sees that we face six major issues:

1. The existing educational programs for the Mexican American have been woefully inadequate and demand serious evaluation.
2. Instruments are lacking for measuring the intelligence and achievement potential of Mexican American youth.
3. A very small percentage of Mexican American students who could qualify for college actually enroll. (And that's a central issue at this Conference.)

4. Legal restrictions in various states discourage instructions in languages other than English.
5. There is an exceedingly high drop-out rate of Mexican Americans in public schools.
6. Society has not recognized or accepted the need for a multilingual, multicultural school environment.

These issues were followed by four imperatives:

1. The preparation of teachers with the skills necessary to instruct Mexican American pupils in such a manner as to insure success. This includes bilingual capability.
2. Instruction in both English and Spanish so that the mother tongue is strengthened concurrent with the pupil's learning a second language and then using both languages.
3. Instruction to preschool Mexican American pupils so that they are more nearly ready to take their place with others by the time they enter school.
4. Complete programs for adults in both basic education and vocational education.

These call for action, and I know you want me to say what is on my mind. There are things we can do. First, take your conference recommendations and get the Educational Associations to adopt the resolutions and come up with programs and designs to implement them. Second, get the national parties to endorse them, not just with verbiage and words, but with appropriate action. Third, take an active part in your student movement.

I feel that one of the greatest accomplishments of this movement is that you are destroying the stereotype that the Mexican American is lazy, that he is disinterested, that he is uninterested in education. You are destroying the very words we heard on the panel the other night where we heard one of the educators say that the responsibility of the Mexican American not being on the campuses of this state appalled the parents. How can we say you young people are not interested? Every conference that I have been able to attend, including yours today, has been put on, thought up by and then funded by the students, and not by the institutions of higher learning. I think that this is the most beautiful thing that is emerging from these conferences--the very same people who are being paid well to do the job must now have young people (who were formerly stereotyped as less-than-dynamic) to put on these conferences to get them into the educational system.

Other areas of achievements of this conference, I believe, lie in the concepts that have emerged, especially those pertaining to bilingualism and biculturalism in our country. There is real insight in the recognition that a man does not have to divorce himself from his own personality, from his family, his language, and his religion to become a good American. Another contribution is the breakdown of the concept of America as the melting pot of the downtrodden people of the world. Perhaps the biggest contribution is the credo of the virtues we value. Yesterday, you young people offered a remarkable set of virtues for this country, offering them at a time when the country seems to need them most: warmth, loyalty, close family ties, humanitarianism, love of community, justice, honesty, compassion, and religion. These are the things that have kept us united as a nation. And you have wisely asked: "If our country really values these things, why do we not all work together with vigor to spread the awareness that these are the things that have made our society great?"

Another contribution you have made is the display of potential leadership for tomorrow. We have seen in the Mexican American youth on our compuses the real nucleus that can provide leadership for the ten million Mexican American people in this country. It is from this nucleus of educated Mexican Americans that others in the Spanish speaking countries to the South of our country--260 million or more--will look for leadership. The linkage between North, Central and South American countries, as my good friend, Phil Montez, mentioned yesterday, will be built by a bridge of understanding. It is to be hoped that the many ties that bind us may be strengthened--ties of historical, cultural, linguistic, and religious understandings.

Perhaps you were not aware of a very important contribution that you made to American education. One of the basic problems the education of Mexican American students has to do with the poor performance of bilingual children on general ability (IQ) and achievement tests. This of course poses a challenge to the whole system of testing in our schools. All I can say to you is: Keep it up!

Another contribution you are making has not yet been articulated on the national scene. You have raised the question: "Is education a right or is it a privilege?" If it is a right, then we must go in one direction; if it is a privilege, then we must go in another. I assume the position that education is a right. And we have a right, and you students have a right to the best education available in the best institutions of higher learning in the land.

Youth are on the move. They have raised the flag. And they are saying "Ya Basta, the Siesta is over." I am asking all here to join with them and they with us to help in the direction of this current. I believe in the tomorrow and I believe that tomorrow is going to be great because you young UMAS students are great people, because there are great youth in Colorado and in Texas and Arizona. And I encourage each one of you to keep up the good work. Keep your face in the wind, your eyes on the sun and continue to work for that beautiful tomorrow. Let history note that we here have come together and let history know that it was the idea of our youth that brought us together. To each of you my congratulations, to each of you my prayer that God will bless all the works you set your hands to. Thank you very kindly and God bless you.

THE WORK IS JUST BEGINNING

The major achievements of the Conference are yet to come. They will come in the form of such developments as the admission of increasing numbers of Mexican Americans in higher education, helping them to attain the goals of higher education, and granting financial assistance for Mexican Americans who wish to attend colleges and universities.

All persons concerned with educational policy making, especially legislators, administrators and members of boards of education, are urged to study the contents of this booklet and to take immediate action to implement the resolutions of the Conference.

The work of the program will continue with the gathering of information about what is being done in other educational settings. Please send us details of programs being carried on in other parts of the country.

Dr. Mayer J. Franklin
School of Education
California State College
Long Beach, California 90801

United Mexican American Students (UMAS)
California State College
Long Beach, California 90801

PAPERS PUBLISHED IN CONNECTION WITH THE CONFERENCE

The following position papers were commissioned in connection with the Conference and distributed to participants so that they would have thorough knowledge of the problems of the Mexican American student, especially in regard to recruitment, retention and financial assistance:

1. The Needs of the Chicano on the College Campus
   Anna Nieto Gomez and J. Anthony Vasquez

2. The Mexican American in Higher Education: Recruitment Frank Angel

3. A Proposal of Guidelines for Reordering Educational Processes of Recruitment and Admissions
   René Nuñez

4. Recruitment of Spanish-Speaking Students Into Higher Education Everett D. Edington

5. Mexicanismo vs. Retention Implications of Retaining Mexican American Students in Higher Education Philip Montez

6. Problems of Retention as Seen by Mexican American Students Members of a Chicano Ethnic Studies Class Conducted by Mrs. Marta Schlatter
   San Diego State College

7. Retention of the Chicano Student as a Comprehensive Program Unit of the Mexican American Student Organization United Mexican American Students at the University of California at Los Angeles

8. Retention of Mexican American Students in College
   Monte E. Perez, Maria Diaz, and Oscar Martinez

9. The Retention of Mexican American Students in Higher Education with Special Reference to Bicultural and Bilingual Problems
   Dr. Manuel H. Guerra

10. Financial Assistance of Mexican American Students in Higher Education Armando Rodriguez

These papers have been processed into the ERIC System and are available for purchase from ERIC Document Reproduction Service, The National Cash Register Company, 4936 Fairmont Avenue, Bethesda, Maryland 20014, or from the United Mexican American Students (UMAS) California State College, Long Beach, California 90801.